

REMARKS

Claims 46-62 are pending. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the remarks.

Claims 46-48, 52-56, and 60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harrington (USPN 6,898,307). The Examiner stated essentially that Harrington teaches all the limitations of Claims 46-48, 52-56, and 60.

Claims 46 and 54 are the independent claims.

Claims 46 and 54 claim, *inter alia*, “producing the augmented reality video by rendering the three-dimensional image data model of the product superimposed on the moving model plane in the video data” as claimed in Claims 46 and 54.

Harrington teaches a method for “a virtual display of imagery and/or text to give the illusion of holding a printed version of an electronic document” (see col. 1, lines 6-11). Harrington does not teach “producing the augmented reality video by rendering the three-dimensional image data model” as claimed in Claims 46 and 54. Indeed, Harrington teaches only a planar object, more particularly a planar piece of paper, rendered on a two-dimensional view plane in three-dimensional space. Harrington’s object, the document, is two-dimensional regardless of whether it is rendered in the two-dimensional space or three-dimensional space. The page is two-dimensional at any pose or orientation. Harrington’s use of the term “three-dimensional object” at col. 7, lines 39-43 is a misnomer, as Harrington clearly intends coordinates of a two-dimensional object, the document, in three-dimensional world coordinates (see for example, col. 9, lines 53-60). This is further supported by Harrington’s assumption that the object is a piece of paper (see col. 7, lines 49-53). Thus, Harrington’s document is not a

three-dimensional image data model as claimed in Claims 46 and 54. Therefore Harrington fails to teach all the limitations of Claims 46 and 54.

Claims 47, 48, 52, and 53 depend from Claim 46. Claims 55, 56, and 60 depend from Claim 54. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 46 and 54. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 49 and 57 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f). The Examiner stated essentially that the Applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter of Claims 49 and 57.

Claims 49 and 57 depend from Claims 46 and 54, respectively. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 46 and 54.

Claims 49 and 57 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Respectfully, OpenGL is merely an industry application program interface (API) for developing 2D and 3D graphical applications. Using OpenGL, an API, to develop a program to render a shadow does not suggest that the Applications did not invent the claimed subject matter. OpenGL is merely an example of a standard for developing applications for rendering 3D graphics.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 49 and 57 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Navab et al. (US Patent Application, Serial No. 09/915,650). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Harrington and Navab teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 49 and 57.

Claims 49 and 57 depend from Claims 46 and 54, respectively. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 46 and 54. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 50, 51, 58, 59, 61, and 62 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Rhoads (USPN 7,050,603). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Harrington and Rhoads teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 50, 51, 58, 59, 61, and 62.

Claims 61 and 62 are the independent claims.

Claims 61 and 62 claim, *inter alia*, “producing the augmented reality video by rendering the three-dimensional image data model of the product superimposed on the moving model plane in the video data, wherein a rendering of the three-dimensional image data model has substantially the pose of the moving model plane.”

Harrington teaches a method for “a virtual display of imagery and/or text to give the illusion of holding a printed version of an electronic document” (see col. 1, lines 6-11). Harrington does not teach or suggest “producing the augmented reality video by rendering the three-dimensional image data model” as claimed in Claims 61 and 62. Indeed, Harrington teaches only a planar object, more particularly a planar piece of paper, rendered on a two-dimensional view plane in three-dimensional space. Harrington's object, the document, is two-dimensional regardless of whether it is rendered in the two-dimensional space or three-dimensional space. The page is two-dimensional at any pose or orientation. Thus, Harrington's document is not a three-dimensional image data model as claimed in Claims 61 and 62.

Rhoads teaches watermarks in video signals (see Abstract). Rhoads does not teach or suggest “producing the augmented reality video by rendering the three-dimensional image data model” as claimed in Claims 61 and 62. Rhoads’ watermarks are machine-readable code embedded in data content (see col. 1, lines 36-40). Thus, Rhoads’ watermarks are not three-dimensional image data model. Rhoads does not teach or suggest augmented reality, much less “producing the augmented reality video by rendering the three-dimensional image data model” as claimed in Claims 61 and 62. Therefore, Rhoads fails to cure the deficiencies of Harrington.

The combined teachings of Harrington and Rhoads fails to teach or suggest “producing the augmented reality video by rendering the three-dimensional image data model” as claimed in Claims 61 and 62.

Claims 50 and 51, and 58 and 59 depend from Claims 46 and 54, respectively. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 46 and 54. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 46-62 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Michele L. Conover
Reg. No. 34,962
Attorney for Applicants

Date: September 29, 2006
SIEMENS CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Department, 5th Floor
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
(732) 321-3100
(732) 321-3030 (FAX)